DOCUMENT RESUME

JC 680 335

ED 022 461

By-Alt, Weston M.

[ASPECTS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE.]

Pub Date [68]
Note-26p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.12
Descriptors-*CAMPUS PLANNING, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *MULTICAMPUS DISTRICTS, *SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
Identifiers-California

This series of eight briefs on the California junior college comprises (1) an argument in favor of the name "community" over "junior" college and remarks on a college campus vs. college district and on extended-district vs. single-campus functions, (2) what makes the junior college unique and the reasons for its increasing rate of growth, (3) determining factors in the establishment of a college, including common interests and characteristics of the people in the district and an area large enough (a) to receive adequate tax support, (b) to afford efficient administration, and (c) to offer a variety of programs, (4) the advantage of a multi-campus district, offering specialization at individual colleges without loss of overall efficiency and service, (5) the benefits of an extended district permitting a broad vocational curriculum to be spread among specialized campuses, thus avoiding expensive duplication, (6) the difficulties of providing specialized job training along with a background comprehensive enough to permit future retraining, (7) the necessity for immediate acquisition of campus sites to offset rising land costs, and (8) evidence favoring the extended-area district with its broad tax base and relative invulnerability to the economic fluctuations of a small area. A preface to the series shows how, in California's tripartite system, the junior college, the state college, and the state university supplement each other. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

The interest and concern of the county committees on school district organization and governing boards of high and unified school districts in the formation of a junior college district are timely and should be understood and appreciated by all parties concerned. Over the last few years, this interest and concern in the development or expansion of junior college districts have been intensified throughout the state. The stimulus for this appears to arise from a number of conditions, the most important ones being:

a. A tremendous increase in college age youth. The records indicate the large increase California had in elementary grade enrollments in the 1940's. These students are or have progressed through the first 12 grades and are descending upon our institutions of higher learning in numbers never before experienced. The burgeoning school enrollment brought about by the increased birth rate and migration into California in the 1940's made its first impact on our institutions of higher learning in 1963 and has exerted steadily increasing pressure since.

b. The changes which have occurred in the state law relating to the support of junior college education. During the last decade, California adopted a series of laws which placed a greater share of the cost of junior college education of nonresident students in the territory from which the student came. Prior to these changes in the law, the support of junior college education came primarily from the territory in the district and the State School Fund.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
JUL 8 1968
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

c. The increase in the number of students who want to continue their education beyond high school. In 1947, 54.4 percent of the California high school graduates entered some institution of higher learning upon graduating.[1] Today, more than 65 percent of the high school graduates enroll at some institution of higher learning. The increase in the number of high school graduates continuing their education and the enrollment bulge of pupils about to graduate may well raise this figure.

d. Increased demand for junior college services and junior college trained people in business and industry.

e. The recommendation of a study of higher education[2] that a greater proportion of the lower division college education be assumed by the junior colleges and that the role of these institutions be expanded in relationship to the state colleges and universities.

1/ A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education, Strayer et al, March, 1948, p. 76.
2/ A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975.

ED022461
JC680337

So that all the people of the state, and especially those directly concerned with and responsible for good junior college district organization, may appreciate the magnitude of that instruction, the role which junior colleges have played and will continue to play in the public education system of California is described in the following paragraphs.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN THE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

I. The Purposes and Functions of California Public Junior Colleges

The success of the California public junior college is attributable directly to the care with which they have identified their functions and have adhered to them. Their purposes have been spelled out in such a way as to differentiate the role of the junior colleges from that of the state colleges and the University of California.

The definition of a junior college and a statement of its functions have been set forth by the Executive Committee of the California Junior College Association as follows:

> "A California junior college is an educational institution...publicly controlled and operated under state laws and regulations of a local governing board....It offers two years of post high school education of collegiate grade and quality leading to the degree of Associate in Arts or equivalent two-year degree. Admission is based on high school graduation or the attainment of 18 years of age and ability to profit from instruction offered.
>
> "Junior colleges design their programs to meet varying community needs. Typically included in the program of California junior colleges are:
>
> "1. Technical-vocational Education for those students who will finish their period of formal education in the junior college. This training should be designed to achieve occupational competence and personal adequacy for living.
>
> "2. General Education designed to prepare every student to function effectively as a member of his family and as a citizen of his community, his state, his nation, and the world.
>
> "3. Lower-division Pre-transfer Education for students who plan to transfer to a four-year college or university after completing two years in a junior college. This training should be normally broad enough to include the lower-division requirements in the liberal arts and in the scientific, engineering, and other professional fields. This includes the salvaging of previously deficient students who demonstrate ability to do university-type work.
>
> "4. Community Service Education involving cooperation with other community agencies to provide instruction and services which meet the educational and cultural needs of all people living in the region.

"5. Guidance and Counseling Services which help each student to choose an occupation in harmony with his interest, aptitudes, and abilities, and to plan an educational program accordingly."

Technical-vocational programs in the junior colleges include drafting, surveying, auto mechanics, welding, building trades, clerical, secretarial, accounting, merchandising, vocational nursing, homemaking, and agriculture. Curriculums for lower-division, pre-medical, pre-law, pre-dentistry, pre-nursing, and other pre-professional programs.

Admission to junior colleges is provided by law for all high school graduates and all persons over 18 years of age who, in the opinion of the administrators of the college, are able to profit from the program. The junior colleges offer educational opportunities for all young people in their own communities at no expense to themselves.

II. Relationship of Junior Colleges to State Colleges and the University of California

The primary function of the state colleges is the education of teachers for the public schools of the state. In addition, they have particular responsibility for offering occupational curriculums requiring four and five years to develop the competencies needed for employment. Other functions include education for responsible citizenship; community service through late afternoon and evening programs; conference leadership; and consultive services to local business, industry. and public agencies, including educational agencies.

Admission to the state colleges is more selective than admission to the junior colleges.

The University of California shares the responsibility with the junior colleges and the state colleges for lower-division instruction, but has developed the policy of limited admission and intensive academic and research activities. It has exclusive responsibility for training for the professions, for graduate work on the doctor's level, and for research and scholarly endeavor of the highest type.

In 1965 the junior colleges enrolled 73.5 percent of all lower-division full-time students in public higher educational institutions in the state. The state colleges enrolled 16.3 percent, and the University of California 10.2 percent.

In the same year, the junior colleges enrolled 85.0 percent of all (full and part time) lower-division students in public higher education. The state colleges enrolled 9.5 percent and the University of California 5.5 percent. This constitutes further evidence of the need for providing junior college education and services in all areas of the state.

A study of the eligibility of high school graduates to enter the three segments of higher education shows that: (a) 11.4 percent were eligible for admission to the University of California; (b) 43.6 percent were eligible for admission to the state colleges (this includes

the above 11.4 percent); (c) 1000 percent were eligible for admission to the junior colleges (this includes both the 11.4 percent and the 43.6 percent of the graduates who were eligible for admission to the state colleges and the University). Thus, 56.4 percent of the high school graduates were not eligible for admission to either the University of California or the state colleges, but were eligible for admission to junior colleges.

III. Special Adult-Community Services of the Junior Colleges

Community service education as a function of the junior colleges requires additional mention. Naturally, this function varies from college to college because of the varying nature of their communities. One of its important services is upgrading programs for employed adults. Changing employment patterns, caused by technological developments, have resulted in classes designed to adjust adults to these new procedures. Classes are usually provided wherever services are needed or requested. Facilities are available both in the late afternoon and evening.

In addition to community service programs, junior colleges provide cultural and general educational opportunities for their constituents. Music, drama, art, and other important expressions of man's creativity are sponsored, and the college becomes a truly cultural center.

Summary

California public junior colleges, enrolling over 73 percent of all lower-division full-time students in the public higher educational system of the state, are operated on the "open door" policy with programs planned to meet the needs of all high school graduates. These diversified programs are designed to care for the broad range of abilities of their students.

The state colleges and the University of California, with their selective admissions and their specialized collegiate programs, do not duplicate the vocational, general education, and adult-community services of the junior colleges. The three insitutions, comprising the California higher educational tripartite system, supplement each other.

With slight revision the above portion of the report was prepared by the Bureau of Junior College Education, Robert F. Stone, former Consultant, California State Department of Education.

IV. A series of briefs on "Aspects of the Junior College" has been prepared by Weston M. Alt, Consultant, Bureau of Junior College Administration and Finance, to highlight specific consideration in junior college organization. These may be secured from that office.
Titles include: (1) What is this Junior College Business Anyway; (2) Uniqueness of the Junior College; (3) Minimum Standards for Junior Colleges; (4) Multi-Campus Districts; (5) Preparation for Employment; (6) Diversification and the Future; (7) Junior College Campus Sites; (8) Do We Have to Make a Decision Today.

Brief No. 1, in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
State Department of Education
Bureau of Junior College Administration
Division of Higher Education

WHAT IS THIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BUSINESS ANYWAY?

When the topic "junior college district organization" is introduced, two of the four words are stressed. . ."junior" and "district." This is unfortunate in a way, since the word "junior" has a faint connotation of inferiority. It brings to mind a father admonishing his son, or the junior executive--someone holding a lower position in rank, the inept subordinate.

In reality, the functions of a junior college are so diverse and affect so many people that it should more properly be called a community college and be regarded on equal status with the university and college systems.

However, when the word "district" is mentioned, from past experience and long association of ourselves and our children, we tend almost immediately to think of elementary school children . . .and neighborhood schools. . .and walking distances of not more than one-half mile. . .and all kids taking the same subjects. . .with the same teacher.

Then we think of high schools and a larger area, but still comfortably close to home. We feel free to call the principal or teacher. We are members of the P. T. A. The curriculum has some variety, but there is a greater similarity than difference. Attendance is required. The big interests of the students are in cars and athletic emblems.

But none of this applies to a junior college district. Here, district is defined as an area or region or section with distinguishable characteristics. A "community" is not necessarily limited to a small area. It, too, has several definitions. It may be people with common interests living in a particular area, or a group linked with a common policy, or a body of persons having a history of social, economic, and political interests in common, or a group of people with a common characteristic or interest living together within a larger society.

Before defining the limits of a junior college district, then, it is well to consider the purposes, scope, and extent of the junior college. These are so broad, so

JC 680335

challenging in their potential and in their demands that we will do well to think in terms of community colleges rather than junior college.

And we must also separate in our thinking the difference between community college campus and a junior college district, and know what functions an extended area district could perform that a single campus might not.

To begin with, let's get rid of the "kids." We have a problem in realizing that our "kids" are really young adults ready to move away from home, to be on their own, to take initiative and responsibility.

At a recent meeting of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, one member sounded off on this practice: "Why do many of you in junior college circles continue to refer to your students as "kids"? You do not have "kids" in junior colleges; you have young men and young women. When you refer to these young adults as "kids" you certainly are not doing anything to improve your image statewide, or in the respective communities served by the junior colleges. Let's drop that expression once and for all."

Junior colleges have been established to provide education for all high school graduates and others over 18 years of age who could benefit by the instruction offered. Last year, students ranged in age from 16 to over 60. Thus the junior college may provide education to an individual for a span of 50 years.

More than 70% of all college freshmen and sophomores in California are enrolled in the junior colleges. This may be attributed to several reasons. Students can live at home and commute at less cost than living away. The transition from high school to college is easier. They are taking advantage of the great diversity of vocational and technical offerings.

Through the process of evolution during a period of 50 years since first authorized by the legislature, the junior college has emerged as a unique institution with increasingly comprehensive programs. It has the greatest flexibility and greatest extent of service of all the segments of higher education.

Let us emphasize the words "college" and "organization" by re-thinking what we are doing and where we are going in terms of an open-door comprehensive community college.

Brief No. 2 in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
State Department of Education
Bureau of Junior College Administration
Division of Higher Education

UNIQUENESS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

It will help to broaden our horizons of understanding, when considering junior college district organization, if we remember that from its inception the junior college has a unique position. Its uniqueness consists of:

- Its multiplicity of courses
- Its function of extending at least two years or more, post high school education
- Its role of decentralizing of higher education
- Its multiplicity of programs, offerings, and services to make it not only community centered but community serving
- Its recognition of the education needs of students who will not pursue further work toward a baccalaureate degree
- Its recognition of the education needs of adults who desire further training or re-training
- Its service in identifying students capable of doing advanced work in colleges and universities
- The opportunity for students to overcome educational gaps.

The community college will continue to be developed at an increasing rate. This projected growth will be caused by:

- The diverting of more students to the junior college from college and university
- The higher standards of admission in the state colleges and universities
- Equalized educational opportunity beyond the high school by its low cost to the student and by its non-selective admissions policy
- National welfare demands that each student be developed to the point that he "becomes all that he is capable of being"
- Reduced work week and therefore necessity for profitable use of leisure

- Extended federal support for education, particularly in vocational-technical education
- The Manpower Development Training Act and other special programs. The cold war GI bill will pay subsistence but not tuition. It is highly probable that recipients will go where tuition is lowest. There is already a backlog of over 300,000 eligible people in the United States.

Public acceptance of the junior college will depend on the development of a short, accurate, dynamic statement of the two-year college, of its successful articulation with the state college and university systems.

It must stand out as a distinct entity with separate facilities. It must have high-quality instructors and place a premium on good teaching. It must meet adequate criteria for establishment. The creation of small and/or poorly supported institutions and districts must be avoided. The minimum criteria of average daily attendance and assessed valuation per average daily attendance are statistics.

The educational criteria are less easy to state but, in the reality of service and function, should be the basis for development and organization of the junior colleges.

Brief No. 3 in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
State Department of Education
Bureau of Junior College Administratio
and Finance
Division of Higher Education

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

Minimum standards set by state law for the establishment of new junior college districts require at least 1,000 units of potential average daily attendance of resident pupils and an assessed valuation of at least $150,000 per unit of potential average daily attendance. These are specified in the Education Code Sections 25431, 25432, and 25431.5.

There are, however, numerous other considerations in the determination of logical and satisfactory junior college districts. Among these desirable characteristics are those related to the educational program, to operation and administration, and to the community of interests on the part of the citizens of the district.

In high density population areas, legal standards can often be met, yet they alone do not necessarily identify the particular grouping of communities or school districts which would constitute the most logical and effective junior college district.

The chief function of a junior college district is to enable the citizens of the area to provide for the effective and economical operation and administration of an educational program beyond grade 12 which is most appropriate to the youth and adults in the particular community.

The Field Service Center, Department of Education, The University of California, Berkeley, presented a report on Junior College District Organization, Northern Alameda County, to Boards of Education concern[ed] in November 1962.

In the study those characteristics which should actually be the determining factors in junior college district organization were well thought out and follow characteristics developed by consultants based upon analysis of previous studies of junior college district organization, as well as upon accumulated experience in the field of junior college education. [They] are:

Characteristics relating to the educational program: The ability of a junior college district to provide an effective educational program for its residents requires

that:

1. Both the potential student body and the geographical area be of sufficient size to warrant offering

   (a) a comprehensive vocational-technical program designed to meet the needs of a society in a period of rapid technological development and occupational change;

   (b) a broad transfer program with a sufficient variety of courses and sections to enable a student to meet entrance requirements in a four-year college or university of his choice; and

   (c) a program of general and liberal arts courses adequate in scope to meet the cultural and social needs of the community.

   Efforts to characterize any given community as being interested primarily in one program or another are futile. Interests, backgrounds, motivations, and abilities of college-age students vary greatly in all communities, hence the technical, the transfer, and the liberal arts program must all be emphasized and often on the same campus.

   However, larger districts may and often should specialize in certain technical work in the vocational-technical program as well as in certain laboratory offerings in the transfer program on one of two or more campuses, thereby avoiding duplication of effort and expense.

   This type of specialization is easier to achieve as well as more likely to happen when a given territory is all within one district than when it is divided among several districts.

2. The natural attendance area of a junior college be in the district maintaining the college. Inter-district agreements and admission of students from non-junior college districts are important but they do not provide for the careful over-all planning that is possible when an area is served by one district. Further, the citizens served by a junior college should have both the privilege and the responsibility, through representation on the governing board, for determining the educational ~~discretion~~ direction of the college.

3. The district be of sufficient size to facilitate good planning and to provide for a carefully designed community service program, including services to older youth and adults in a manner that supplements rather than duplicates the services of other agencies.

Such factors as the following will cause these services to become increasingly important:

(a) growing problems of urban development,

(b) an increasing amount of non-work time on the part of most people,

(c) occupational displacement and the need for retraining workers, and

(d) the increasing awareness of social, cultural, and civic concerns in our society. A district of considerable geographical scope can plan more adequately for these services than can a district whose boundaries are restricted.

Characteristics relating to operation and administration: The citizens of any county are entitled to and should insist on a plan of junior college organization which:

1. Avoids undue duplication of administrative machinery and effort. While there is no specific criterion which spells out how large a district should be in order to have maximum administrative efficiency, it can be argued that contiguous territories with roughly similar characteristics will be served better by one board and one central administration than by several administrative units.

2. Spreads the cost of operation and capital outlay over a wide territory thereby making for a more equitable sharing of such costs as well as for a sufficient assessed valuation to guarantee an optimum program for the greatest number of students.

3. Provides for maximum coordination of the junior college and the high schools in the area, for cooperative planning with neighboring junior colleges, and for articulation with the four-year ~~colleges~~ institutions to which its students will transfer.

Coordination with high schools from which its pupils are drawn can be achieved through various organizational structures. The unified district is considered by many to be particularly effective in this regard. However, unless the great majority of students in a junior college maintained by a unified district live in that district, the efforts toward coordination are minimized.

Whether a separate junior college district establishes relationships with the high schools in the district that lead to effective coordination in curriculum planning, instruction, and counseling, depends upon the vigor with which it attacks this problem. It can be argued that a desirable characteristic of the junior college district is that it can work out a plan of articulation with the several high school districts which it embraces and thus provide for uniformity of coordination over a wide area.

4. Locates campuses with greatest accessibility to the greatest number of persons to be served. This characteristic is important not only because it reduces students' time, energy and expense involved in travel, but also because many studies have shown that accessibility and proximity are important factors in encouraging young people to pursue their education beyond high school.

Characteristics relating to the "community of interests": One of the assumptions underlying the junior college concept is the notion that it may and most probably should be a "community college" in the sense that it becomes a focal point in the community for a great variety of educational, cultural, and social activities.

The term "community college" connotes a close interrelationship of the college and the life of the community; the college looks to the community for suggestions in program planning and the community looks to the college for many different services to many different persons.

In essence, this implies that those communities which are included in a junior college district should have as many interests and characteristics in common as possible. In a growing metropolitan area it is, of course, impossible to cluster completely those

communities with common interests so that a strong identification with a community college is assured. But, when possible, this factor should be considered either in determining the boundaries of the entire district or by determining the principal service areas of each campus established.

"Community" does not have a narrow definition, it can be broad in scope.

Brief No. 4, in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
Bureau of Junior College Administration & Finance
Division of Higher Education
State Department of Education

Multi-Campus Districts

Many areas, especially the more densely populated ones, have set as their goal the wide distribution of junior college campuses in order that a stated ideal of "at least two years of higher education within a commuting distance for every person of college age" may be reached.

In more sparcely populated areas students may of necessity have to live away from home, either in dormitories or in private homes, in order to provide a college of sufficient size to justify its existance in terms of service, rather than as a monument to local pride or prejudice.

The attempt to reach this goal has given rise to a multi-campus type of organization; and the trend in this direction will be accelerated in the coming years, for the reason that the real goals of the community college can not be attained in excessively large institutions, nor in small districts.

There is at some point an optimum enrollment at which both diversity of program and personal guidance and instruction can be most effectively provided.

At a workshop on establishing junior colleges held in 1961, the president of Orange Coast College, speaking on past experience of the institution, showed the relative effectiveness in offering diversified programs as his college grew in size.

According to him, experience at Orange Coast College during its development showed the following relationship between full-time student population and approximate number of different courses offered:

Population	Number of Courses, Different
400	73
600	92
1000	140
1500	175
2000	187
2500	200
3000	210

From this, it can be seen that two small colleges of 600 students might each offer 92 courses, but a single college of 1000 students could offer 140 courses. The importance

of this can not be overestimated. A junior college district comprising two or more colleges allows for specialization of offerings at the individual colleges while providing greater service.

This advantage of a multi-campus district applies not only to the transfer program but is of equal, perhaps more importance to the occupational and vocational programs where the uniqueness of the individual, is more apparent.

Brief No. 5 in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
Bureau of Junior College Administration
and Finance
Division of Higher Education
State Department of Education

PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

The scope of junior college programs designed to prepare students for employment covers virtually the entire range of skilled and technical occupations. The range of vocational interests is so great that no one campus can afford to provide all the facilities and instruction required. Some of the facilities are expensive, indeed; and to be justified need to be used as much as possible.

Not to offer a requested program is to deprive the student, of whatever age, the opportunity for self-improvement, even the livelihood for which he may be best suited. To build facilities and provide instruction for a very limited number of students is beyond the financial ability of any single college. The answer lies in an extended area district where specialization at each campus can be provided.

Occupation-centered curriculums offered by California public junior colleges in the fall of ~~1963~~ 1965 totalled ~~121~~ 124 offerings in seven broad fields. The list has been added to each year since. Note, these are curricula, not a listing of course offerings which, would run in the thousands. Think of that!

Now the human being is a diverse and wonderful creature. Each person is an individual with different likes and dislikes, different aptitudes and attitudes and different interests. Self-improvement of the individual is a recognized goal, whether that improvement is basic training in a skill, or up-grading in a job or position, or development of a hobby or avocation.

Of the ~~121~~ 124 curricula, no college district offered them all. Some curricula were offered by as few as one college, such as gunsmithing at Lassen, ~~sanitation~~ petroleum technology at ~~San Diego~~ Orange Coast, or translator ~~or~~ and interpreter at Los Angeles City College. The most any single college offered was ~~37~~ 55 at Long Beach.

Even that great, sprawling, diverse metropolous of Los Angeles with its 41,151 a.d.a. and assessed valuation of just under $8 billion (1964-65 report) does not

duplicate expensive facilities on its ~~seven~~ five campuses, but specializes. Los Angeles offered ~~82~~ 87 of the ~~121~~ 124 curricula, but ~~48~~ 44 were single shot offerings offered at only one of the colleges. Here is an example of broadening the curriculum without duplication of expensive facilities that can be done by extending the district.

Brief No. 6 in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
Bureau of Junior College Administration and Finance
Division of Higher Education
State Department of Education

DIVERSIFICATION AND THE FUTURE

What about change? What does the future hold? Does this have any implication for junior college organization? The future holds radical new changes, that's what! The new world into which we are marching demands as never before the greatest of adaptability in the coming generation.

Ninety per cent of the occupations followed today were not in existence 60 years ago, a New England study disclosed. New occupations are springing up every day. On the average, a person entering gainful employment today will change his occupation three times during his lifetime.

Young people must be prepared not only to master one career, one type of vocation to start out in life, but also have the kind of comprehensive background that will enable them to move readily into new fields.

Our industry, our technology, our services, already are changing so rapidly that a man can become obsolete in a profession before his working years are nearly done.

One of the major new vistas in junior college education will be the retraining of manpower as swift changes in many fields demand. The man lacking the comprehensive education background to do this will be left behind, a casualty of automation or technology.

Thus the paradox of our present challenge. At a time when the complexity of our automated society almost forces the narrowest specialization, we are confronted with the prospect that educating the most broadly grounded individual is equally imperative.

Structuring education to meet this need is a formidable task. There must be a comprehensive program at the junior college level, not merely the university or college transfer program, not merely a "trade school," not merely a two-year associate degree, but all of these, to meet the emerging design.

The burden of such training and retraining will fall on the junior college. Meeting that challenge will be more than any single small campus or district can do. Flexibility

is needed ~~and~~ as well as a broad base of operation to cope with the problem.

We are reminded of the anecdote of two neighborhood stores competing with each other in the struggle for existence, undercutting services and prices in order to attract customers. The owners reached a simple solution; each bought a share of the others' business, became a partner, so to speak.

While certain basic good were offered at both stores, special lines were offered at each; and ~~the other~~ each smiled when his neighbor's business grew and prospered, because he was a part of it. There is an analogy here that could well be applied to junior college district organization.

Brief No. 7, in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
Bureau of Junior College Administration & Finance
Division of Higher Education
State Department of Education

Junior College Campus Sites - How to Save Money

The location of junior college campuses should be planned without regard to existing junior college district boundary lines, or county lines, or high school lines, or unified district lines, or any other artificial barrier. They should be planned for accessibility to students.

Further, they should be of sufficient size to allow for a complete campus including all buildings, spaces between buildings, service areas, physical education facilities, with good traffic patterns, and located away from industrial areas.

Now those are such simple statements that one wonders why they were mentioned. When one learns that such a site as has been mentioned may involve in the neighborhood of 150 acres, interest is aroused.

When one begins to think of how many suitable sites are left in some area under consideration, and the designs that real estate developers, and shopping and industrial magnates have on that same property, he begins to realize the competition is tough time is running out.

And when he gets down to the nitty-gritty of rising land value and compares the cost of "what could have been" five years ago, with the costs of "what might have been" today, with the costs of "what it is going to be when we get around to it" tomorrow, he is shocked and horrified.

Let us consider a horrible example. Not here because it couldn't happen ~~to us~~ here, but somewhere in California. Would you believe the Garden Grove Unified School District of Orange County?

Garden Grove used to be pastoral in nature. Now it is diversified and its schools had an overall daily attendance of 45,963 in 1964-65. It is surrounded on the north by North Orange County Junior College District, on the south and west by Orange Coast Junior College District, and on the south and ~~west~~ east by Santa Ana Junior College District.

Now a district of ~~its~~ this size could stand a junior college campus (not a district, just a campus). Suppose it became part of a junior college district at the earliest, say July 1, 1967. What about getting a site?

Recently, the Orange County Superintendent of Schools office was asked to get some facts and figures from reputable real estate people for the cost of a 150 acre site in the Garden Grove area. How do prices now stack up with a mere five years ago? What will they be five years hence. The answers are something to ponder a bit.

Ready? First, there is not that much acreage available in one piece except in the industrial area and competition is hot and heavy for that. Not only is that location an untenable one but you couldn't afford it.

Second, the last area of that size in the residential area went at $40,000 an acre. A neighboring area, Anaheim, bought a smaller acreage for a community center at $50,000 an acre.

Third, to buy a proper sized site now would require picking up as large a parcel as possible at $25,000 an acre and acquiring the rest by condemnation of property upon which houses have already been built. You guess what a jury would award a "little man whose homestead or birthright is taken by a "Big Government Agency."

Five years ago several full-size sites were available at $18,000 an acre. It is conceivable that at least one might have been properly located and meet the criteria for good site utilization and planning.

Five years from now the going rate will be $30,000 an acre (minimum estimate) to $50,000 an acre (maximum estimate) depending on location. Plus added costs for condemnation, of course.

So the facts of life in Orange County are two: One, the good sites are all gone. Two, the people haven't saved any money by not buying then or now. Haven't they? "Sure we have, the money has not been spent," say some.

But let us take 150 acres at $18,000 an acre and 150 acres at $50,000 an acre, and include condemnation costs in those figures so as not to be picayunish. Cost five years ago, $2,700,000; cost now, $3,750,000; cost five years hence, $7,500,000.

Put it this way, for the same amount of money the area could have purchased 1⅓ sites for what it can today, or 2.8 sites for what it will do tomorrow. And remember, too, every dollar that goes into site purchase and improvement is one less dollar that goes into buildings, furniture and equipment, and teaching tools.

So the theory that we are saving money by not being in a junior college district may be fallacious in the long run. We'll pay double tomorrow for what we saved yesterday.

Remember this horrible example was in Orange County. It couldn't happen here-- land areas disappearing, subdividers active, shopping areas on the move, industry spreading out, values on the rise. But it just might happen here.

Brief No. 8 in a series on Aspects of the Junior College

By Weston M. Alt, Consultant
Bureau of Junior College Administration
and Finance
Division of Higher Education
State Department of Education

DO WE HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION TODAY?

Permanent provision for junior college educational opportunities--is that a decision that we have to make today? Suppose we wait? Maybe the problem will go away! Maybe we won't have to make a decision.

Decisions can be made in three ways:

(1) One way is to do nothing. If we do nothing someone else will make the decision, although we might not like it.

(2) Another way is to make a decision to maintain the status quo--what was good enough for me is good enough for my children, or

(3) A third way is to think in broad terms, weighing a comprehensive program against costs, and organizing for action. It is in the immediate and continuing interest of each area to take the third degree.

A recent study (by Mr. Walt Oglesby, Bureau of School District Organization, State Department of Education, May, 1966), shows that each of five possible combinations of area in north San Diego county would meet the minimum standards required by the legislature for new junior college districts, both with regard to size and to assessed valuation. The question, then, is the minimum standard sufficient to meet the educational specifications of the future.

Financing junior college education. The cost of educating students who attend junior colleges from non-district areas is ~~covered~~ met by a levy against the tax-payers in these areas, including a charge for the full cost of educating the students (less the amount paid by the state), plus a charge of $300 per student per year for the use of facilities.

Historically, the tax rate for junior college education has been lower for non-district areas. This condition cannot be attributed to greater wealth in the non-district areas but rather to the fact that fewer students from those areas have attended junior

colleges.

Further tax increases are to be expected as the number of students from such areas increase. It should be noted that there is no limit to the tax rate that must be levied for that purpose, whereas there is a statutory limit of 35 cents for general purposes that can be levied by junior college districts unless a higher limit is voted by the people. It is ironic but true that the closer the non-districts tax approaches the thirty-five cent rate, the less educational opportunity is clouded by and subverted to pure tax rate consideration.

In the meantime, those from non-district terriroty are not represented on the Board of Trustees, have no ~~votes~~ voice, no say in the management, control and operation of the colleges their students attend. Indeed, the area cannot be considered in the location of future junior college sites, and effective planning is thereby limited.

The tax base. The relative wealth of school districts is judged by the assessed valuation per student to be educated. One of the greatest aims in California is to provide equal educational opportunity for all. Therefore, any district organization proposal should keep this important concept in mind.

Of the four possible combination of areas, in Mr. Oglesby's study, differences in assessed valuation per potential average daily attendance of the segments, for 1966-67 range from $1,796 to $26,989.

Now the smaller difference in dollars isn't so bad. But in terms of pupils, one area would have two and one-quarter times as many pupils as the other. In fact, by 1969-70, the smaller section would have less than 900 students and would not meet the state minimum. Almost equal dollars but highly unequal educational program!

Conversely, in the option where there is almost equal distribution of students (a difference of 200) occurs the greatest discrepancy in support--$26,989. Unequal dollars and, therefore, unequal educational opportunity!

These findings are not unique to San Diego County. They are substantiated in nature to other studies of other areas throughout the state. Differences are a matter of degree, not of substance.

But do we have to make a decision today? Maybe the passage of time will tend to reduce the inequities in attendance and wealth.

In the San Diego study, by 1969-70 the least difference in average daily attendance will be 284. The corresponding difference in assessed valuation will increase to $29,688.

In 1969-70 the least difference in assessed valuation per ADA $19,261 would occur when one institution would be half again as large as the other, with the smaller barely about minimum size.

It is significant that in each configuration except that of the total area, the difference in the assessed valuation per ADA will be accelerated. This pattern is reflected in other studies. Just waiting for time to pass won't solve the problem. The future in itself doesn't hold the key to separate but equal opportunities. Today is the day for decision.

Evidence then, based on a careful study of student enrollment and using statewide norms for the per cent of high school graduates who continue on to junior college, indicates that the fluctuations in enrollment and assessed valuation can best be neutralized on an extended area basis.

Further, larger districts are less subject to the risks of economic patterns and fluctuations and could be expected to create a stronger, more diversified tax base than any two smaller segments.

Conclusion. The rapid movement toward independence has been accompanied by considerable growth in the size of junior college districts. Ten junior college districts are county-wide or nearly so, and six include substantial portions of two or more counties.

Present practices in multiple-campus districts place great emphasis on the autonomy of individual campuses and their responsiveness to the special characteristics of their local communities.

There may be new resources and staff available to identify and respond to community needs.

Indeed, the freeing of local leadership from major responsibilities of fiscal

and facilities management of districts, may give a substantial boost to the community college concept.

Decisions about district structure and governance should always be tested against the purposes of junior college education.